UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,735	08/17/2001	Dinesh C. Verma	YOR920010700US1	6228

48813   7590   06/17/2008
LAW OFFICE OF IDO TUCHMAN (YOR)
ECM #72212
PO Box 4668
New York, NY 10163-4668

EXAMINER
AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pair@tuchmanlaw.com
idotuchman@gmail.com

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/932,735
Filing Date: August 17, 2001
Appellant(s): VERMA, DINESH C.

Ido Tuchman
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 29 January 2008 and the appeal brief replacement section (appealed claims appendix) appealing from the Office action mailed 29 August 2007

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2002/0007317   CALLAGHAN ET AL.   1-2002

6,073,241   ROSENBERG ET AL.   6-2000

.**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Callaghan et al. (US 2002/0007317), hereinafter referred to as Callaghan, in view of

Rosenberg et al. (US 6,073,241), hereinafter referred to as Rosenberg.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art

only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome

by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in

the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an

invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject

matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed

in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR

1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and

reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the

application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer

in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing

that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under

35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

3.   Regarding claim 1, Callaghan teaches a method comprising:

employing a first web server in a first DNS domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3,

para. 0051, use of multiple domains), and a second web server in a second DNS

domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3, para. 0051, use of multiple domains), wherein the

first web server uses a first user tracking mechanism (p. 3, para. 0050, ll. 2-3, state

information is recorded from a first domain) to collect client information (p. 3, para.

0050, ll. 2-3, state information) and stores the client information as a client record (p. 4,

para. 0054, ll. 3-6, state information is stored in a cookie);

the first web server directing a client to access a resource at the second Web-

Server (p. 3, para. 0050, proxy server provides state information); and

the second web server using the client record in conjunction with a second user

tracking mechanism (p. 3, para. 0050 and p. 5, para. 0073, a second domain stores

state information).

Callaghan teaches the method of cross-domain information sharing with cookies

and reasoning for storage of information (p. 3, para. 0043, p. 4, para. 0053 and p. 8,

para. 0117) but does not explicitly teach (a) "storage of a client record in a database,"

(b) "said resource encapsulating information about a location of the client record in the database" and (c) "the second web server decapsulating the location and retrieving the client record from the database."

In related art, Rosenberg teaches on these limitations wherein Rosenberg teaches with respect to (a) "storage of a client record in a database" wherein Rosenberg teaches the use of a database to store client information (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches on (b) "said resource encapsulating information about a location of the client record in the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches an entry in the database that is created by a first web server, is identifiable by a unique value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of web servers (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches on (c) "the second web server decapsulating the location and retrieving the client record from the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record and therefore allows different web servers to gain access to the client record located in the database (col. 5, ll. 26-30). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

4.   Regarding claim 2, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first
and second user tracking mechanisms use cookies for storing the user client
information (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0043, storage of state information in cookies).

5.   Regarding claim 3, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first
web server authenticates the client, and the client record includes user authentication
data enabling the second web server to use a common sign-on with the sign-on of the
first web server (Callaghan, p. 6, para. 0085-0087).

6.   Regarding claim 4, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first
web server stores within the client record at least one parameter which determines at
least one characteristic of at least one page to be sent to the client by the second web
server (Callaghan, p.1, para. 0004-0005).

7.   Regarding claim 5, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the
parameter includes at least one user preference (Callaghan, p. 1, para. 0004-0005).

8.   Regarding claim 6, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein said at
least one user preference is related to at least one detected purchasing habit
(Callaghan, p. 1, para. 0005).

9.   Regarding claim 7, Callaghan teaches a method comprising:

        employing a first web server in a first DNS domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3,
para. 0051, use of multiple domains), and a second web server in a second DNS
domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3, para. 0051, use of multiple domains);

        enabling said first and second web servers to share cookie information (p. 3,
para. 43, share cookie information across domains); and

coordinating cookies across said first and second domains (p. 3, para. 0050, proxy coordinates state information between different servers).

Callaghan teaches the method of cross-domain information sharing with cookies and reasoning for storage of information (p. 3, para. 0043, p. 4, para. 0053 and p. 8, para. 0117) but does not explicitly teach (a) "storing a client record in a database by the first web server" and (b) "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database."

In related art, Rosenberg teaches on these limitations wherein Rosenberg teaches with respect to (a) "storing a client record in a database by the first web server" wherein Rosenberg teaches the use of a database to store client information (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches on (b) "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches an entry in the database that is created by a first web server, is identifiable by a unique value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of web servers (col. 5, ll. 5-15). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

10.   Regarding claim 8, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the step

of coordinating is performed by a cookie coordinator accessible to said first and second

Web-Servers (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0046-0049).

11.   Regarding claim 9, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further

comprising providing a cookie coordinator accessible to said first and second Web-

Servers to perform the step of coordinating (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0046-0049).

12.   Regarding claim 10, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the

step of enabling includes the first web server setting a first cookie having a first identity

and the second web server setting a second cookie having a second identity, and the

step of coordinating maps the first and second identities to a third identity shared across

said first and second domain (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053-0056).

13.   Regarding claim 11, Callaghan teaches a method comprising:

means for employing a first web server in a first DNS domain (fig. 2, www server

204; p. 3, para. 0051, use of multiple domains), and a second web server in a second

DNS domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3, para. 0051, use of multiple domains),

wherein the first web server uses a first user tracking mechanism (p. 3, para. 0050, ll. 2-

3, state information is recorded from a first domain) to collect client information (p. 3,

para. 0050, ll. 2-3, state information) and stores the client information as a client record

(p. 4, para. 0054, ll. 3-6, state information is stored in a cookie);

means for the first web server directing a client to access a resource at the

second Web-Server (p. 3, para. 0050, proxy server provides state information); and

means for the second web server using the client record in conjunction with a

second user tracking mechanism (p. 3, para. 0050 and p. 5, para. 0073, a second

domain stores state information).

Callaghan teaches the method of cross-domain information sharing with cookies

and reasoning for storage of information (p. 3, para. 0043, p. 4, para. 0053 and p. 8,

para. 0117) but does not explicitly teach (a) "storage of a client record in a database,"

(b) "means for said resource encapsulating information about a location of the client

record in the database" and (c) "means for the second web server decapsulating the

location and retrieving the client record from the database."

In related art, Rosenberg teaches on these limitations wherein Rosenberg

teaches with respect to (a) "storage of a client record in a database" wherein Rosenberg

teaches the use of a database to store client information (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg

teaches on (b) "means for said resource encapsulating information about a location of

the client record in the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches an entry in the database

that is created by a first web server, is identifiable by a unique value and the client

record is accessible by a plurality of web servers (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches

on (c) "means for the second web server decapsulating the location and retrieving the

client record from the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the

unique identification value that identifies the client record and therefore allows different

web servers to gain access to the client record located in the database (col. 5, ll. 26-30).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it

useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share

client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

14.   Regarding claim 12, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing coordination of a first user tracking mechanism in a first web server and second user tracking mechanism in a second web-server, the computer readable program code means in said article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps of claim 1 (Callaghan, p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

15.   Regarding claim 13, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing coordination of a first user tracking mechanism in a first web server and second user tracking mechanism in a second web-server, the computer readable program code means in said article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps of claim 7 (Callaghan, p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

16.   Regarding claim 14, Callaghan teaches a method comprising:

        employing a first user tracker in a first domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3, para. 0051, use of multiple domains), and a second user tracker in a second domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3, para. 0051, use of multiple domains), wherein the first user

tracker uses a first user tracking mechanism (p. 3, para. 0050, ll. 2-3, state information

is recorded from a first domain) to collect client information (p. 3, para. 0050, ll. 2-3,

state information) and stores the client information as a client record (p. 4, para. 0054, ll.

3-6, state information is stored in a cookie);

the first user tracker directing a client to access a resource at the second Web-

Server (p. 3, para. 0050, proxy server provides state information); and

the second user tracker using the client record in conjunction with a second user

tracking mechanism (p. 3, para. 0050 and p. 5, para. 0073, a second domain stores

state information).

Callaghan teaches the method of cross-domain information sharing with cookies

and reasoning for storage of information (p. 3, para. 0043, p. 4, para. 0053 and p. 8,

para. 0117) but does not explicitly teach (a) "storage of a client record in a database,"

(b) "said resource encapsulating information about a location of the client record in the

database" and (c) "the second user tracker decapsulating the location and retrieving the

client record from the database."

In related art, Rosenberg teaches on these limitations wherein Rosenberg

teaches with respect to (a) "storage of a client record in a database" wherein Rosenberg

teaches the use of a database to store client information (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg

teaches on (b) "said resource encapsulating information about a location of the client

record in the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches an entry in the database that is

created by a first web server, is identifiable by a unique value and the client record is

accessible by a plurality of web servers (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches on (c) "the

second user tracker decapsulating the location and retrieving the client record from the

database" wherein Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value

that identifies the client record and therefore allows different web servers to gain access

to the client record located in the database (col. 5, ll. 26-30). One of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify

Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record

information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein

a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains

(Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

17.   Regarding claim 15, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach a program storage device

readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the

machine to perform method steps for using cookies, said method steps comprising the

steps of claim 1 (Callaghan, p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

18.   Regarding claim 16, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach a program storage device

readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the

machine to perform method steps for using cookies, said method steps comprising the

steps of claim 7 (Callaghan, p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

19.   Regarding claim 17, Callaghan and Roseberg teach a computer program product

comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means

embodied therein for causing tracking of users, the computer readable program code

means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code

means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 11 (Callaghan, p. 2, para.

0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

20.   Regarding claim 18, Callaghan teaches a method comprising:

employing a first web server in a first DNS domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3,

para. 0051, use of multiple domains), and a second web server in a second DNS

domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3, para. 0051, use of multiple domains), wherein the

first web server maintains a first private cookie at a browser and the second web server

maintains a second private cookie at the browser (p. 3 para. 0050 and p. 5, para. 0073,

a second domain stores state information);

accessing a cookie coordinator when the first private cookie is received by the

first web-server (p. 3, para. 0050, proxy server provides state information); and

mapping a first identity in the first private cookie and a second identity in the

second private cookie to a single identity common across the multiple domains (p. 4,

para. 0054, ll. 3-6, state information specific to one user is stored).

Callaghan teaches the method of cross-domain information sharing with cookies

and reasoning for storage of information (p. 3, para. 0043, p. 4, para. 0053 and p. 8,

para. 0117) but does not explicitly teach (a) "storing a client record in a database by the

first web server" and (b) "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates

information about a location of the client record in the database."

In related art, Rosenberg teaches on these limitations wherein Rosenberg teaches with respect to (a) "storing a client record in a database by the first web server" wherein Rosenberg teaches the use of a database to store client information (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches on (b) "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches an entry in the database that is created by a first web server, is identifiable by a unique value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of web servers (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches further the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record and therefore allows different web servers to gain access to the client record located in the database (col. 5, ll. 26-30). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

21.   Regarding claim 19, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising using the single identity to look up the identity of users across the different domains (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053), and the cookie coordinator learning the mapping of the various cookies that are placed independently on the browser by the different servers (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053).

22.   Regarding claim 20, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the use of a program

storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions

executable by the machine to perform method steps for tracking users, said method

steps comprising the steps of claim 18 (Callaghan , p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para.

0044-0046).

23.   Regarding claim 21, Callaghan teaches an apparatus comprising:

        a web server interface to interface with a first web server in a first DNS domain

(fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3, para. 0051, use of multiple domains) and to interface a

second web server in a second DNS domain (fig. 2, www server 204; p. 3, para. 0051,

use of multiple domains);

            said first web server having:

                a first user tracker to collect client information (p. 3, para. 0050, ll.

2-3, record state information) and store the client information as a client record (p. 4,

para. 0054, ll. 3-6, state information is stored in a cookie);

                a redirector for the first web server to direct a client to access a

resource at the second web server (p. 3, para. 0050, proxy server provides state

information); and

                a second user tracker for the second web server to use the client

record in conjunction with a second user tracker mechanism (p. 3, para. 0050 and p. 5,

para. 0073, a second domain stores state information).

Callaghan teaches the method of cross-domain information sharing with cookies and reasoning for storage of information (p. 3, para. 0043, p. 4, para. 0053 and p. 8, para. 0117) but does not explicitly teach (a) "the storage of a client record in a cookie coordinator database," (b) "an encapsulator for said resource to encapsulate information about a location of the client record in the database" and (c) "a decapsulator for the second web server to decapsulate a location and retrieve the client record from the database."

In related art, Rosenberg teaches on these limitations wherein Rosenberg teaches with respect to (a) "the storage of a client record in a cookie coordinator database" wherein Rosenberg teaches the use of a database to store client information (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches on (b) "an encapsulator for said resource to encapsulate information about a location of the client record in the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches an entry in the database that is created by a first web server, is identifiable by a unique value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of web servers (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches on (c) "a decapsulator for the second web server to decapsulate a location and retrieve the client record from the database" wherein Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record and therefore allows different web servers to gain access to the client record located in the database (col. 5, ll. 26-30). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein

a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains

(Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

24.   Regarding claim 22, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach a computer program

product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program

code means embodied therein for causing tracking of users, the computer readable

program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable

program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 21

(Callaghan , p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

25.   Regarding claim 23, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further

comprising:

    wherein the database is a cookie coordination database (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll.

11-15); and

    wherein directing the client to access the resource at the second Web-Server

includes sending the client a link to the second Web-Server (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 25-

30).

26.   Regarding claim 24, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein

directing the client to access the resource at the second Web-Server includes sending a

HTTP response code from the first Web-Server configured to cause the client to be

redirected to the second Web-Server using HTTP redirection. (Callaghan, see page 3,

paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well-known HTTP technology

methods).

27.   Regarding claim 25, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising wherein the database is a cookie coordination database (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 11-15).

28.   Regarding claim 26, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising sending a HTTP response code from the first web server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second web server using HTTP redirection (Callaghan, see page 3, paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well-known HTTP technology methods).

29.   Regarding claim 27, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach an apparatus further comprising:

    wherein the database is a cookie coordination database (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 11-15); and

    wherein means for the first web server directing the client to access the resource at the second Web-Server includes means for sending the client a link to the second Web-Server (col. 5, ll. 25-30).

30.   Regarding claim 28, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach an apparatus further comprising means for sending a HTTP response code from the first web server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second web server using HTTP redirection (Callaghan, see page 3, paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well-known HTTP technology methods).

31.   Regarding claim 29, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach a method further

comprising:

        wherein the database is a cookie coordination database (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll.

11-15); and

        wherein means for the first web server directing the client to access the resource

at the second Web-Server includes means for sending the client a link to the second

Web-Server (col. 5, ll. 25-30).

32.   Regarding claim 30, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further

comprising sending a HTTP response code from the first user tracker configured to

cause the client to be redirected to the second user tracker using HTTP redirection

(Callaghan, see page 3, paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well-known

HTTP technology methods).

33.   Regarding claim 31, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further

comprising sending a HTTP response code from the first web server configured to

cause the client to be redirected to the second web server using HTTP redirection

(Callaghan, see page 3, paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well-known

HTTP technology methods).

34.   Regarding claim 32, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the apparatus wherein the

redirector is configured to send a HTTP response code from the first web server

configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second web server using HTTP

redirection (Callaghan, see page 3, paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well-known HTTP technology methods).

35.   Regarding claim 33, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising:

storing a first cookie by the first user tracking mechanism, the first cookie including a first identity (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053-0056); and

storing a second cookie by the second user tracking mechanism, the second cookie including a second identity and correlating the first cookie and the second cookie (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0059, second state information).

36.   Regarding claim 34, Callaghan and Rosenberg teaches the method wherein coordinating cookies across said first and second domains comprises storing in the cookies information correlating a first cookie having a first identity and associated with the first domain and a second cookie having a second identity and associated with the second domain (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053-0056, Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 25-28).

37.   Regarding claim 35, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first private cookie an the second private cookie store information correlating the first private cookie and the second private cookie (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053-0056, Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 25-28).

(10) Response to Argument

Claim 1

1.   With respect to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious

over Callaghan (US 2002/0007317), in view of Rosenberg et al. (US 6,073,241), the

appellant argues (a) that the passages cited by the examiner in Callaghan and

Rosenberg contain no teaching or suggestion of "a resource encapsulating information

about a location of a client record in a database," (b) the passages cited by the

examiner fail to teach or suggest "a second web server decapsulating the location from

the resource encapsulating information about the location of the client record in the

database," (c) that it is illogical to assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would be

motivated to combine the teachings of Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg and

(d) one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Callaghan's teaching of

sharing state information across multiple domains with any teaching of encapsulating

information about a location of a client record in the database.

2.   In response to (a), the examiner respectfully submits that Rosenberg teaches "a

resource encapsulating information about a location of a client record in a database"

wherein Rosenberg teaches in column 5, lines 5-15 the use of a database wherein an

entry is created by a first web server and the database entry is identifiable by a unique

identification value. The database entry is accessible by a plurality of servers within a

network by use of the unique identification value. The unique identification value is

used to encapsulate the location of the record or entry within the database. The

appellant argues that a unique identification value is not inherently equivalent to a

location in a database. The examiner does not find this argument persuasive and

respectfully submits that Rosenberg, in column 5, lines 10-15, clearly teaches that a

unique identification value identifies an entry in a database. An entry in a database is

therefore deemed equivalent to a location in a database.

3.   In response to (b), the examiner respectfully submits that Rosenberg teaches "a

second web server decapsulating the location from the resource encapsulating

information about the location of the client record in the database" wherein Rosenberg

teaches on the aspect of a resource encapsulating information with respect to a client

record in a database. Rosenberg teaches further on the decapsulation aspect in

column 5, lines 20-25 wherein other servers, a second web server, may retrieve

instructions as to how to access the database entry utilizing the aforementioned unique

identification value. Therefore, Rosenberg clearly teaches on the aspect wherein the

second web server decapsulates the location and retrieves the client record from the

database.

4.   In response to (c), the examiner submits that it would have been logical to

incorporate the teachings of Rosenberg with the teachings of Callaghan. The examiner

submits that Callaghan and Rosenberg are deemed analogous art. Rosenberg is relied

upon for teaching what Callaghan lacks as outlined in the above rejection. The

argument that the environments that Callaghan and Rosenberg operate in are

substantially different is not found persuasive because they are both intended to

operate within networked computer environments and obvious variations thereof as

mentioned in column 1, lines 14-30 of Rosenberg and page 1, paragraph 0003 of

Callaghan.

5.   In response to (d), the examiner submits that one skilled in the art would be
motivated to combine Callaghan's teaching of sharing state information across multiple
domains with any teaching of encapsulating information about a location of a client
record in the database because, as set forth in the rejection, one of ordinary skill in the
art would have found it obvious to utilize a database to store client records, as taught by
Rosenberg in column 5, lines 26-30.

Claim 7

6.   With respect to the rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious
over Callaghan (US 2002/0007317), in view of Rosenberg et al. (US 6,073,241), the
appellant argues (e) the passages cited by the examiner contain no teaching or
suggestion of "a location of a client record in a database which is encapsulated within a
link."

7.   In response to (e), the examiner respectfully submits that Rosenberg teaches "a
resource encapsulating information about a location of a client record in a database"
wherein Rosenberg teaches in column 5, lines 5-15 a unique identification value which
identifies an entry in a database. An entry in a database is equivalent to a location in a
database. As mentioned in column 5, lines 26-30, the unique identification value taught
by Rosenberg is utilized by appropriate servers in a networking environment to
specifically identify and achieve access to a client record entry in a database and
therefore is functionally equivalent to appellant's claimed link.

Claim 33

8.   With respect to the rejection of claim 33 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious

over Callaghan (US 2002/0007317), in view of Rosenberg et al. (US 6,073,241), the

appellant argues (f) the passages cited by the examiner contain no teaching or

suggestion of "correlating a first cookie and a second cookie."

9.   In response to (f), the examiner respectfully submits that Rosenberg teaches

"correlating a first cookie and a second cookie" wherein Rosenberg teaches in column

5, lines 25-28 wherein a cookie can include header information which includes

identification information with respect to a database entry. When a second cookie

utilizes this header as well and has the same identification information, the cookies are

correlated and therefore what is taught by Rosenberg meets the limitation for being

within the scope of the claim.

Claim 34

10.   With respect to the rejection of claim 34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious

over Callaghan (US 2002/0007317), in view of Rosenberg et al. (US 6,073,241), the

appellant argues (g) the passages cited by the examiner contain no teaching or

suggestion of "correlating a first cookie and a second cookie."

11.   In response to (g), the examiner respectfully submits that Rosenberg teaches

"correlating a first cookie and a second cookie" wherein Rosenberg teaches in column

5, lines 25-28 wherein a cookie can include header information which includes

identification information with respect to a database entry. When a second cookie

utilizes this header as well and has the same identification information, the cookies are

correlated and therefore what is taught by Rosenberg meets the limitation for being within the scope of the claim.

<u>Claim 35</u>

12.   With respect to the rejection of claim 35 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Callaghan (US 2002/0007317), in view of Rosenberg et al. (US 6,073,241), the appellant argues (h) the passages cited by the examiner contain no teaching or suggestion of "correlating a first cookie and a second cookie."

13.   In response to (h), the examiner respectfully submits that Rosenberg teaches "correlating a first cookie and a second cookie" wherein Rosenberg teaches in column 5, lines 25-28 wherein a cookie can include header information which includes identification information with respect to a database entry. When a second cookie utilizes this header as well and has the same identification information, the cookies are correlated and therefore what is taught by Rosenberg meets the limitation for being within the scope of the claim.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin Ailes

/B. A. A./

Examiner, Art Unit 2142

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142

Conferees:

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145